



A rating in every pot!

10 Mar 75

LAPUTA is an occasional publication by and for the postal Diplomacy Rating Commission, a voluntary association of postal Diplomacy ratingsmasters. It is automatically sent to members of the Commission. Interested parties may subscribe (on a delayed basis) @15¢ an issue. A copy will also be deposited with the Postal Diplomacy Archives in Lebanon IN, and with the Boardman Number Custodian. This issue is Alcalá Publication #592, edited and published by Rod Walker, "Alcalá", 1273 Crest Dr., Encinitas CA 92024.

THIS ISSUE is Constitution Issue #4. It contains the results of our votes. I have given them in tabular form below. The initials of the members are self-explanatory, except that BU is Walt Buchanan. The votes are Y, yes; N, no, -, other. The other columns are Article numbers; for Article IV, * notes "first continuation" and ** "second continuation". Jeff Key's votes for II and II.D were tied together in such a way that if IID had passed, his vote for II would be Y. Under IX, Len Lakofka voted for (as a write-in) ABO/ABT.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	IIC	IID	IV*	IV**
B	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
BU	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
K	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
L	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	Y
P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
W	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

The result is that the entire Constitution as written in LAPUTA 12 is adopted, with the exceptions of the C and D sections of Article 11.

Now that we have a Constitution, a number of issues immediately arise, to which I would like to devote the remainder of this issue.

1. I am sure that Len Lakofka's write-in vote can be construed as an amendment proposal. Therefore, I would like comments/debate and then we can vote on it. The Con requires a 2/3 vote for an amendment. Len proposes ABO/ABT. What does everybody think on this?

2. The effect of our action is to terminate Jeff Key's membership. I do not realize if the rest of you were aware that this would happen, but it did: Jeff meets none of the membership criteria of Article II. Since Jeff has been a long-time member and even Chairman, it may be that the members did not intend this result. Therefore, how do you feel about taking a special vote to extend his membership...say, for a period of 6 months to give him time to finish his ratings? My own argument is that since Jeff was a member at the time the Con was adopted, he should continue as an active member. Comments?

3. Article IIA is missing a word. It is my intention, in transcribing this article to insert the word "regular"...thus, "Any person who maintains a a rating system for regular postal Diplomacy games..." That is the intent of that article, although I clumsily neglected to phrase it properly. If there is any objection, it will remain as it is written and we can take a formal vote; if none, I will assume you all read the article the way I do and accept the clarifying rewording.

4. Article V is in effect a membership requirement. The implication is that a member who does not return a ballot, even after the Chairman has moved heaven and earth to get him to do it, is no longer a member. I would appreciate any comments or guidance on how to administer this requirement fairly and justly.

5. Article VII is to some extent limited by Article V...that is, although the Chairman sets a deadline for receipt of ballots, he is

obligated to make efforts to obtain those that don't arrive by the deadline. That is what happened on this last vote, by the way. Two ballots were out by the deadline. I wrote and reminded both members that the ballots were due. One set crossed my request in the mail. The other member, who's pretty busy, had forgotten and sent them off immediately with a note to the effect I can depend on him in the future. I'm sure I can, as with all of you, so no problem. But this is the procedure I intend to follow in the future.

6. Now that the SRB is an agreed principle, you will notice it is lacking in one detail...the extent to which it is binding on the members. That is because it isn't. Or, rather, it isn't to varying degrees. Walt Buchanan has pretty much committed himself publically to accept all PDRC decisions. My attitude is about the same, although never so stated publically before. Even if the SRB were binding, it could only be so to the extent allowed by the idiosyncracies of the various ratings. My own thought is that while the SRB is not now binding in any way, you guys may wish to discuss the possibility of making it so, to one extent or another. Some alternatives which occur to me:

- a. The SRB would be binding on PDRC members, period.
 - b. The SRB would be binding only where a game were included or excluded by unanimous vote.
 - c. The SRB would be binding only where a game were included or excluded on a vote where the members agreed in advance to make it binding.
- One factor, too, is this: if the SRB becomes binding to some extent, should new members be required to accept the bound portion as a condition of membership?

7. Under the Constitution, any Ratingsmaster is eligible to be a member. Ever NAmerican rating is represented but one. This is the DA's "Ratings Survey". Now, this poses some problems, as follows:

- a. Len Lakofka has stated he regards the RS as a survey rather than as a rating system.
- b. TDA states that no one person is responsible for the system --we are therefore faced with the question of whether there can actually be a "Ratingsmaster" under those circumstances...in other words, what constitutes a RM?
- c. It is not always easy to communicate with the DA, and I guess you all know why.

Therefore: it is my intention to inform the DA that if there is a person who may be considered RM or the RS, he is eligible to be a member of the PDRC. If I receive no objection from any member by the deadline below, I will do that. If I do, we'll have to vote or something. In the meantime, I want some advice: what constitutes a Ratingsmaster?? (Oh--one additional difficulty is that the RS is the same as the Averaged CFCRL, of which I became the Ratingsmaster this month. The two systems, although identical in design, yield different results owing to differences in administration.)

DEADLINE for comments, advice, objections, &c. is Tuesday, 1 April 1975. I will publish that week and include the material I get then. If warranted, I will try to construct a ballot based on your comments and suggestions on the various items.

8. OH...drag out your copy of Len Lakofka's proposals for the BNC and the PDRC. I would like comments on those, too, please.

...And Doug Beyerlein is getting married on 26 April, so there will be a brief lull in our work until he gets back from his honeymoon.